

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1 and 4 have been amended herein, and claim 2 has been cancelled. Therefore, claims 1 and 3-4 will remain pending and under examination. No new matter is being presented, and approval and reconsideration of the claims, in view of the following remarks, are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-4 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Hansen (U.S. Patent No. 6,370,362) in view of A5306ST Instruction Manual (hereinafter "Instruction Manual"). The rejections are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. The following is a comparison between embodiments of the present invention and the cited references.

Independent claim 1, for example, is amended herein to recite a judging unit operable to judge whether a predetermined operation has been performed on at least one of the first operation units with the case in a closed state and the locking function enabled; and an operation control unit operable, when the judging unit has judged in the affirmative, to enable processing associated with operation of at least one of the first operation units by temporarily canceling the locking function, wherein the operation control unit disables the enabled processing associated with operation of the at least one first operation units, if the at least one first operation units is not operated within a predetermined time period or if the case is opened.

As an exemplary advantage to embodiments of the present invention, keys may be locked when the case is closed (in the closed state), and the locked state of the keys can be temporarily canceled by (i) performing an operation of canceling the locked state of the keys while the case is in the closed state, and/or (ii) opening the case, for example. Furthermore, although the locked state of the keys is temporarily canceled by performing an operation of canceling the locked state of the keys while the case is in the closed state, if no operation is performed and the case remains in the closed state for a predetermined time period since the temporary cancelation of the

locked state of the keys, the temporary cancelation of the locked state of the keys will be terminated, thus putting the keys back to the locked state.

On the other hand, Hansen discloses that when a controller detects that the slide has been closed, pressing the left soft key 8 will cause the keys to be locked. If the user presses the right soft key 8 or does not do anything for more than three seconds, the keys will be in the unlocked state.

In contrast, according to embodiments of the present invention, when the case is closed, keys are locked without performing any operation, as long as they key-lock function is enabled. The locked state of the keys can be temporarily canceled (*i.e.*, the keys become operable) by performing an operation of canceling the locked state of the keys when the case is in the closed state. However, if no operation is performed for a predetermined time period from the temporary cancelation of the locked state of the keys, the temporary cancelation of the locked state of the keys will end.

It is submitted therefore, that Hansen fails to teach or even suggest the foregoing features of independent claim 1. Independent claim 4, as amended, recites substantially similar features to those described herein, and thus it is further submitted that independent claims 1 and 4 patentably distinguish over the cited reference.

“Instruction Manual” discusses cancelation of a locked state of the keys; however, it does not teach or suggest *terminating such cancelation of the locked state of the keys when a predetermined time period has elapsed* (and is not cited as doing such). Thus, “Instruction Manual” fails to cure the deficiencies of Hansen described herein.

Therefore, independent claims 1 and 4 patentably distinguish over Hansen and Instruction Manual, alone or in combination. Dependent claim 3 inherits the patentability of independent claim 1 and is submitted to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons. The features of dependent claim 2 have been incorporated into independent claims 1 and 4.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 278542007000. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: September 28, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By /Michael Stanley/

Michael Stanley

Registration No.: 58,523

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
12531 High Bluff Drive, Suite 100
San Diego, California 92130-2040
(858) 314-7795